

Support the President's policies by giving him a Congress in harmony with him.

Jane Addams of Hull House on Why Women Should Vote

To those of my readers who would admit that although woman has no right to shirk her old obligations, that all of these could be fulfilled more easily through her influence upon the men of her family than through the direct use of the ballot, I should like to tell a little story. I have a friend in Chicago who is the mother of four sons, and the grandmother of twelve grandsons who are voters. She is a woman of wealth, of secured social position, of sterling character and clear intelligence, and may, therefore, quite fairly be cited as a "woman of influence." Upon one of her recent birthdays, when she was asked how she had kept so young, she promptly replied: "Because I have always advocated at least one unpopular cause." It may have been in pursuance of this policy that for many years she has been an ardent advocate of free silver, although her manufacturing family are all republicans! I happened to call at her house on the day that Mr. McKinley was elected president against Mr. Bryan for the first time. I found my friend much disturbed. She said somewhat bitterly that she had at last discovered what the much-vaunted influence of woman was worth; that she had implored each one of her sons and grandsons; had entered into endless arguments and moral appeals to induce one of them to represent her convictions by voting for Mr. Bryan; that, although sincerely devoted to her, each one had assured her that his convictions forced him to vote the republican ticket! She said that all she had been able to secure was the promise from one of the grandsons, for whom she had an especial tenderness because he bore her husband's name, that he would not vote at all. He could not vote for Bryan, but out of respect for her feeling he would refrain from voting for McKinley. My friend said that for many years she had suspected that women could influence men only in regard to those things in which men were not deeply concerned, but when it came to persuading a man to a woman's view in affairs of politics or business it was absolutely useless. I contended that a woman had no right to persuade a man to vote against his own convictions; that I respected the men of her family for following their own judgment regardless of the appeal which the honored head of the house had made to their chivalric devotion. To this she replied that she would agree with that point of view when a woman had the same opportunity as a man to register her convictions by vote. I believed then, as I do now, that nothing is gained when independence of judgment is assailed by "influence," sentimental or otherwise, and that we test advancing civilization somewhat by our power to respect differences and by our tolerance of another's honest conviction.

This is, perhaps, the attitude of many busy women who would be glad to use the ballot to further public measures in which they are interested and for which they have been working for years. It offends the taste of such a woman to be obliged to use indirect "influence" when she is accustomed to well-bred, open action in other affairs, and she very much resents the time spent in persuading a voter to take her point of view, and possibly to give up his own, quite as honest and valuable as hers, although different because resulting from totally different experience. Public-spirited women who wish to use the ballot, as I know them, do not wish to do the work of men nor to take over men's affairs. They simply want an opportunity to do their own work and to take care of those affairs which naturally and historically belong to women, but which are constantly being overlooked and slighted in our political institutions.

In a complex community like the modern city all points of view need to be represented.

To turn the administration of our civic affairs wholly over to men may mean that the American city will continue to push forward in its commercial and industrial development, and continue to lag behind in those things which make a city healthful and beautiful. After all, woman's tra-

ditional function has been to make her dwelling-place both clean and fair. Is that dreariness in city life, that lack of domesticity which the humblest farm dwelling presents, due to a withdrawal of one of the naturally co-operating forces? If women have in any sense been responsible for the gentler side of life which softens and blurs some of its harsher conditions, may they not have a duty to perform in our American cities?

In closing, may I recapitulate that if woman would fulfill her traditional responsibility to her own children; if she would educate and protect from danger factory children who must find their recreation on the streets; if she would bring the cultural forces to bear upon our materialistic civilization; and if she would do it all with the dignity and directness fitting one who carries on her immemorial duties, then she must bring herself to the use of the ballot—that latest implement for self-government. May we not fairly say that American women need this implement in order to preserve the home?

HUSTING OF WISCONSIN

Paul Husting, democratic nominee for United States senator in Wisconsin, should be elected. Men of all parties who believe in the rule of the people, who hope for public officers who never sacrifice any essentials of the eternal verities to the passing needs of expediency, can with confidence vote for Mr. Husting. Mr. Husting has served eight years in the Wisconsin state senate. He has a record of achievement of which any public servant might be proud. The remarkable work of Mr. Husting in the Wisconsin state senate is so clearly and pointedly set forth in a letter written to The Commoner by State Senator Randolph of Wisconsin, that it is reproduced below. Every voter in Wisconsin should read and study the work of Senator Husting. He has earned a promotion and the national legislative branch of the government offers a field for Senator Husting to extend his work in behalf of the people. In the United States senate Mr. Husting could be of inestimable service to the people of Wisconsin, he would be a tower of strength to the democratic side of the senate, and another able champion of President Wilson's policies. The letter follows.

W. J. BRYAN.

Manitowoc, Wis.

The Commoner, Lincoln, Neb.: The people of the 13th senatorial district of Wisconsin eight years ago handed to Paul O. Husting his commission to represent them in the state's upper chamber. Now he hands back that commission and asks that his record in four regular sessions and several special sessions of the legislature say for him whether he has rendered faithful service for them or to the privilege-seeking interests that haunt every legislative body.

On the day that he entered that senate chamber a new influence was felt. Toryism recognized a new and powerful enemy. In skillful defence and in intelligently planned affirmative battles Senator Husting kept up the fight. Every bill, no matter who originated it, that brought government closer to the people and more directly under their control; every movement to expose or prevent corrupt political methods; every bill striking at private monopoly; every bill to bring corporations under more effective control; every bill designed in the farmers' interests, to better the workers' conditions or to secure fairer compensation for the wounded upon the industrial battlefield; every bill intelligently carrying out the Wisconsin idea of social welfare he fought for and voted for, and many he originated. Their enumeration would make a long list. Towering above them all are his water-powers movement and the senatorial election investigation. Senator Husting is one of the leaders in Wisconsin of the movement to retain in the people as much of the socially created, and to be created, values of the state's water powers as the fundamental law will permit. With a statesman's vision he comprehended the tremendous industrial power that will be wielded by those who in the future will claim to own the "white coal" set by nature to turn the wheels for the benefit of all, and the campaign he waged in party councils and in the leg-

islature for his idea of conserving in the people this unearned increment while at the same time encouraging the water's use by liberal franchises until a law was enacted going as far as the courts will at present permit, was a campaign of constructive statesmanship that far transcends in its ultimate importance any of the many progressive movements of the past decade in Wisconsin. Only those in that struggle know its history. Like another David, Senator Husting met and vanquished a Goliath in the form of the most powerful lobby that had gathered in Madison in years. Harried at every turn, with every subtle lure that adroit agents could array against him, meeting every form of specious sophistry, he struggled on, efficient, patient, untiring and finally irresistible. Then came the struggle in the courts, and defeat. He went back, began again and bulldozed stone by stone and made his bill a law with the help of progressives of three parties. Now he is fighting for a constitutional amendment that will permit his task to be completed.

He was the leader of the movement that compelled the senatorial candidates of 1908 to disclose to the world the facts of the enormous sums of money thrown broadcast by some of them, and these revelations resulted in a stringent corrupt practices act. In this investigation he showed a grasp of detail and a relentless inquisitorial power.

Senator Husting is a skillful legislator, a consummate parliamentary tactician and a fighter who never knows defeat. He has a pleasing personality, an affable manner, and an unusual gift of holding the respect of opponent and supporter.

Should it cause surprise that the people of his district by overwhelming vote have decided to reward eight years of faithful service by wider opportunities for service; that they and the real democrats of all parties in Wisconsin wish to send to the national councils this doughty champion of the people's cause to help hold up the hands of the people's president in his great work.

A dreamer who makes his dreams come true, a new tribute of the people is promised from Wisconsin. His nomination was an augury of the continued march of democracy and progress.

SAMUEL W. RANDOLPH.

THE PHILIPPINE BILL

The Philippine bill, now before the house, prepared and reported by Mr. Jones, of Virginia, represents the democratic position on the subject, and has the endorsement of the administration.

Among the speeches made against it in congress, that delivered by Mr. Mann of Illinois, the leader of the republican party, may be considered as a statement of the republican party's position on the Philippine bill. He begins with the assumption that we are certain to have war with the Orient; he hopes it may be nothing more than a commercial war, but, in his opinion, we are bound to have a war of some kind.

Then treating his prophecy as if it were really a fact, he proceeds to advocate imperialism as a means of advancing this nation's commercial interests. He favors the kind of commercialism that provides war; he puts the dollar before the man. The democratic party follows a wiser policy when it puts moral and political principles first and makes commercial interests subservient to these; it puts man first and the dollar afterwards. We are indebted to Congressman Mann for making the issues plain, but in this matter, as in almost all others, the right thing is also the expedient thing. Righteousness exalteth a nation not only morally but materially. Independence for the Filipinos is entirely in harmony with commercial expansion. A naval base is the only thing we need in the Philippines. If, to secure this, we undertake to administer a foreign government over an unwilling people, we lay up wrath for the day of wrath, whereas we shall make friends of the Filipinos if we give them independence. Independence and friendship make better neighbors than enemies. The Jones bill stands for the doctrine of the declaration of independence, and it does not menace any legitimate commercial interests. W. J. BRYAN.